



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF  
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

DIW 11-99

Paper No. 5

ROCKEY, MILNAMOW & KATZ  
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, 47TH FLOOR  
180 NORTH STETSON  
CHICAGO, IL 60601

**COPY MAILED**

**DEC 21 1999**

**SPECIAL PROGRAMS OFFICE  
DAC FOR PATENTS**

In re Application of :  
Ritzdorf et al. :  
Application No. 09/018,783 :  
Filed: 4 February, 1998 :  
Attorney Docket No. 11928US01 :

**ON PETITION**

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)<sup>1</sup>, filed on 8 November, 1999, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned on 24 June, 1998, for failure to timely submit an executed oath or declaration as required by the Notice To File Missing Parts of Application (Notice) mailed on 23 April, 1998. The Notice set a two (2) month shortened statutory period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 26 March, 1999.

---

<sup>1</sup>Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

The statement of unintentional delay was not signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the delay in filing a timely response was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was in fact unintentional, petitioner should make a reasonable inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must so notify the Office.

This application file will be forwarded to Office of Initial Patent Examination for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to Petitions Attorney Douglas I. Wood at (703) 308-6918.



Beverly M. Flanagan  
Supervisory Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner  
for Patent Policy and Projects